

**CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE  
HIDDEN LAKES-PHASE IV TRACT,  
HORRY COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA**



**CHICORA RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION 435**

# **CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE HIDDEN LAKES-PHASE IV TRACT, HORRY COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA**

Prepared By:  
Michael Trinkley, Ph.D., RPA  
and  
Nicole Southerland

Prepared For:  
Mr. Joe Floyd  
The Brigman Co.  
P.O. Box 1532  
Conway, SC 29528

**CHICORA RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION 435**



Chicora Foundation, Inc.  
PO Box 8664  
Columbia, SC 29202-8664  
803/787-6910  
Email: [chicora@earthlink.net](mailto:chicora@earthlink.net)  
[www.chicora.org](http://www.chicora.org)

December 21, 2005

This report is printed on permanent paper ∞

©2005 by Chicora Foundation, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted, or transcribed in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without prior permission of Chicora Foundation, Inc. except for brief quotations used in reviews. Full credit must be given to the authors, publisher, and project sponsor.

## ABSTRACT

This study reports on an intensive cultural resources survey of an approximately 202 acre tract of land in the east portion of Horry County, near the city of Little River, South Carolina. The work was conducted to assist The Brigman Company in complying with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the regulations codified in 36CFR800.

The parcel, which includes 142 acres of upland suitable for shovel testing and 60 acres of wetland and poorly drained soils, is to be used for residential development. The topography is somewhat flat with no distinct ridge tops.

The proposed undertaking will require the clearing of the tract, followed by construction of various infrastructure elements such as roads, stormwater drainage, and utilities. Individual lot construction will involve grading, additional utility construction, and subsequent building of structures. These activities have the potential to affect archaeological and historical sites and this survey was conducted to identify and assess archaeological and historical sites that may be in the project area. For this study, an area of potential effect (APE) 0.5 mile around the tract was assumed.

An investigation of the archaeological site files at the S.C. Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology failed to identify any previously recorded sites.

The S.C. Department of Archives and History GIS was consulted for any previously recorded sites. No such sites were found in the project APE.

The archaeological survey of the lot incorporated shovel testing at 100-foot intervals along transects placed at 100-foot intervals within

the high probability areas within the tract boundaries (i.e. no wetlands or poorly drained soils). All shovel test fill was screened through ¼-inch mesh and the shovel tests were backfilled at the completion of the study. A total of 561 shovel tests were excavated along 64 transect lines.

As a result of these investigations no sites were identified. This is likely due to the lack of any distinct ridge top and distance from a permanent water source.

A survey of public roads within a 0.5 mile of the proposed undertaking was conducted in an effort to identify any architectural sites over 50 years old which also retained their integrity. No such sites were found.

Finally, it is possible that archaeological remains may be encountered in the project area during clearing activities. Crews should be advised to report any discoveries of concentrations of artifacts (such as bottles, ceramics, or projectile points) or brick rubble to the project engineer, who should in turn report the material to the State Historic Preservation Office or to Chicora Foundation (the process of dealing with late discoveries is discussed in 36CFR800.13(b)(3)). No construction should take place in the vicinity of these late discoveries until they have been examined by an archaeologist and, if necessary, have been processed according to 36CFR800.13(b)(3).



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures		iv
Introduction		1
Natural Environment		5
<i>Physiography</i>	5	
<i>Geology and Soils</i>	5	
<i>Floristics</i>	6	
<i>Climate</i>	7	
Prehistoric and Historic Synopsis		9
<i>Previous Research</i>	9	
<i>Prehistoric Overview</i>	9	
<i>Historical Synopsis</i>	13	
Research Methods and Findings		17
<i>Archaeological Field Methods and Findings</i>	17	
<i>Architectural Survey</i>	18	
<i>Site Evaluation and Findings</i>	18	
Conclusions		23
Sources Cited		25

## LIST OF FIGURES

### Figure

1. Project vicinity in Horry County	2
2. Project area	3
3. View of wetlands in the survey area	5
4. View of mixed pines and hardwoods in the project area	7
5. Generalized cultural sequence for South Carolina	10
6. Portion of Mills' <i>Atlas</i> showing the project vicinity	13
7. Portion of the 1918 Horry County Soil Survey showing the project area	15
8. Portion of the 1939 <i>General Highway and Transportation Map of Horry County</i>	16
9. Survey area with transects	18
10. View of a brick pillar from a razed structure on the property	19
11. View of graves from Mt. Calvary Cemetery	19
12. View of cemetery across dirt road from the project area	20
13. View of project area from the middle of the cemetery	20
14. View of construction south from the project area	21

## INTRODUCTION

This investigation was conducted by Dr. Michael Trinkley of Chicora Foundation, Inc. for Mr. Joe Floyd of the Brigman Company, Inc. in Conway, SC. The work was conducted to assist this company comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the regulations codified in 36CFR800.

The project site consists of a 202 acre tract proposed to be used for a residential neighborhood located in east Horry County near the town of Little River (Figure 1). The survey area is irregular in shape with the southern portion bounding S-111, the northwest edge and a portion of the northern portion bounding Cemetery Road (Figure 2). The rest of the tract was defined by a cut line, which separated the tract from the surrounding wooded properties.

The tract consists of approximately 60 acres of wetlands and poorly drained soils and 142 acres of upland suitable for surveying. While the modern topographic map (created in 1990) shows a large portion of the property as open fields, the current survey encountered only a mixed pine and hardwood forest and wetlands. The surrounding area is somewhat rural, but the area is being quickly developed, including a neighborhood directly across S-111 from the current project area.

The tract, as previously mentioned, is intended to be used for a residential neighborhood. This work will require the clearing of the project area and construction of utilities such as electrical, sewer, and water lines as well as an expanded road system when development begins. There will likely be increased short-term noise, traffic, and dust levels associated with the project. These activities have the potential to damage or otherwise affect any cultural resources that may be present on the tract.

This study, however, does not consider any future secondary impact of the project, including increased or expanded development of this portion of Horry County.

We were requested by Mr. Joe Floyd of the Brigman Company, Inc. to provide a proposal for the survey on July 18, 2005. A proposal was sent on July 20. A revised proposal was submitted on November 15. This proposal was accepted and notice to proceed was given on November 16. Work on the project began on November 22.

Initial background investigations incorporated a review of the site files at the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology by Chicora Foundation. As a result of that work, no sites were found in the 0.5 mile APE.

In addition, the South Carolina Department of Archives and History GIS was consulted to check for any NRHP buildings, districts, structures, sites, or objects in the study area. Horry County received a historic survey in 1988 (Utterback 1988), as well as a 1973 survey that identified several structures in nearby Little River (Waccamaw Regional Planning and Development Council 1973). It was thought unlikely that additional resources will be found.

Archival and historical research was limited to a review of secondary sources available in the Chicora Foundation files.

The archaeological survey was conducted from December 14-20, 2005 by Ms. Julie Poppell and Ms. Nicole Southerland under the direction of Dr. Michael Trinkley. Report production was conducted at Chicora's laboratories in Columbia, South Carolina from December 21-27, 2005.



# CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE HIDDEN LAKES-PHASE IV TRACT




Figure 1. Project vicinity in Horry County (basemap is USGS South Carolina 1:500,000).



## INTRODUCTION




Figure 2. Project area (basemap is USGS Longs 7.5').

This report details the investigation of the project area undertaken by Chicora Foundation and the results of that investigation.



## NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

### Physiography

The project area is situated in eastern Horry County, less than 1.0 mile northwest of Little River. The level topography in the region is interrupted by only occasional marsh sloughs and small wetland depressions. The dominating feature is the Waccamaw River to the west, which meanders, forming large cutoffs or lakes, as well as much swamp.

In general, the topography of the study tract is level, with only a slight elevation change toward the various wetlands on the property. The Waccamaw essentially bisects the county into east and west halves and drains numerous swamps between the river and the Atlantic Ocean. On a regional scale the topography slopes either southeast toward the Waccamaw or northwest toward smaller drainages such as Maple Swamp.

Horry County is bounded to the north by Brunswick and Columbus counties, North Carolina, to the east by the Atlantic Ocean, to the south by Georgetown County, and to the west by Dillon and Marion counties. It lies within the Lower Coastal Plain, which is made up of fluvial deposits that contain varying amounts of sand, silt, and clay (Dudley 1986). This is also the area known as the Atlantic Coast Flatwoods which extends from the sea shore inland about 30 to 70 miles. The area is characterized by broad flats and depressions. While there are areas of well drained

soils, much of the flatwoods consist primarily of poorly drained soils with clay subsoils, especially near the coast and in the project area (Ellerbe 1974:18).

Elevations may range from sea level to about 100 feet above mean sea level in the Lower Coastal Plain. In the project area there are no areas where the land is higher than about 45 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), and some of the area is lower toward the wetlands, most of which occur in the central portion of the tract. A noticeable characteristic of this physiographic area is how gradually the flat lands seem to grade into either freshwater marshes, savannahs, or swamps.

### Geology and Soils

The geology of the Lower Coastal Plain has been well described by Cooke (1936) who



Figure 3. View of wetlands in the survey area.

notes that from the Cape Fear River in North Carolina to Winyah Bay in South Carolina, the

coast forms a “great arc scooped out by waves” (Cooke 1936:4). This area has been described by Brown (1975) as being an arcuate strand. In this area salt marshes are poorly developed or absent and few tidal inlets breach the coast (Smith 1933:20-21). The situation is the result of an erosional history about 100,000 years ago. In general, however, the geology of the Lower Coastal Plain is less complex than that of other sections of the state.

As previously mentioned, the area is dominated by fluvial deposits of unconsolidated sands and clays. Rocks are almost totally absent from the area, although Mills (1972[1826]:584) does note that some compact shell limestone was found on the Waccamaw between Gaul’s Ferry and Bear Bluff.

Soils were primarily formed during the Pleistocene epoch and several terraces were deposited (Dudley 1986:85). The project vicinity is characterized by the Yauhannah-Ogeechee-Bladen Association (Dudley 1986). This association, which occurs on nearly level to gently sloping soils, consists of moderately well drained and poorly drained soils with a loamy or sandy surface and a loamy to clayey subsoil.

The survey area includes five soil series – Yauhannah fine sandy loam, Centenary fine sand, Yemassee loamy fine sand, Bladen fine sandy loam, and Hobcaw fine sandy loam. Actual shovel testing occurred on the two moderately well-drained soils – Yauhannah and Centenary. Yauhannah soils have an Ap horizon of brown (10YR4/3) fine sandy loam to 0.7 foot in depth to yellowish brown (10YR5/6) sandy clay loam to a depth of 1.4 feet. Centenary soils have an A horizon of dark gray (10YR4/1) fine sand to a depth of 0.4 foot over a brownish yellow (10YR6/6) fine sand to 1.8 feet in depth.

The survey also encountered some of the somewhat poorly drained Yemassee soils. This series has an A horizon of black (10YR2/1) loamy fine sand to 0.6 foot in depth over a light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) loamy fine sand to 1.1 feet in

depth.

Due to the poorly to very poorly drained soils of the Bladen and Hobcaw series, no shovel testing occurred in these areas. Bladen soils have an A horizon of very dark gray (10YR3/1) fine sandy loam to 0.5 foot in depth over a gray (10YR5/1) clay to 2.6 feet in depth. Hobcaw soils have an A horizon of black (10YR2/1) fine sandy loam to 1.0 foot in depth over a very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) loamy sand to 1.3 feet in depth.

Because of a significant rainfall during surveying, the poorly drained soils were apparent in the field due to the standing water.

In 1826 Robert Mills commented that soil was rich and productive adjacent to Horry’s rivers. Even the uplands were well suited for cotton with their light sandy soil underlaid by clay. But he commented that a great deal of swamp land was found in the district, “fit only for cattle ranges” (Mills 1972[1826]:585). Edmund Ruffin, who managed to visit much of South Carolina’s coast in the mid-1840s, never sought to go to Horry, commenting that:

I would have gone to Horry, which is called the “dark corner” of the state, but for having no expectation of finding anyone acquainted with or feeling interested in the objects of explorations (Mathew 1992:215).

### **Floristics**

Vegetation in Horry County is characterized in relation to the previously broad topographic patterns of poorly drained floodplains and lowlands, and the well drained uplands.

The vegetation in Horry County has been classified by Küchler (1964) as part of the Oak-Hickory-Pine forest, based on potential natural vegetation. This would consist of medium tall to tall forests of broadleaf deciduous and needleleaf



Figure 4. View of mixed pines and hardwoods in the project area.

ever-green trees. More specifically, however, the floodplains are covered by mixed hardwoods, including bald cypress, tupelo gum, and black gum. Less water tolerant trees, such as pines, occur on the uplands or on better drained slopes. Also found in the bottomlands, floodplains, and Carolina bays are red maple, ash, water oak, elm, and sweet gum. On the better drained uplands pine dominates, with loblolly and longleaf pines being indigenous and the slash pine introduced.

In 1826 Mills in describing the Horry District vegetation, notes:

The long leaf pine abounds, also the cypress, live oak, water oak, white oak, &c. The fruit trees are, peaches, apples, pears, plums, cherries, figs; besides strawberries, which grow wild, whortleberries, &c. The forest trees begin to bud in the latter part of March, and the fruit trees in April. The pine and cypress are mostly used for buildings (Mills 1972[1826]:582).

The poorly drained swamps and flatwoods of Horry County were not particularly attractive to early settlers and much of the area was not actively farmed for a number of years.

The current project area was shown on the 1990 topographic as having a large portion of open land – likely agricultural given the slight ridge and swale noticed in the field. However, these fields are

currently covered in a mixed pine and hardwood forest with some areas exhibiting a dense understory. The wetland areas were covered in primarily hardwoods.

### Climate

Elevation, latitude, and distance from the coast work close together to affect the climate of South Carolina, although Horry is clearly dominated by its maritime location. Much of the weather is controlled by the proximity of the Gulf Stream, about 50 miles offshore. In addition, the more westerly mountains block or moderate many of the cold air masses that flow across the state from west to east. Even the very cold air masses which cross the mountains are warmed by compression before the descent on the Coast.

As a result, the climate of Horry County is temperate. The winters are relatively mild with a mean temperature of 48°F and the summers are very warm and humid, with a mean temperature of 79°F and average humidity of 60%. Rainfall in the amount of about 51 inches is good for a broad range of crops. About 31 inches (or 60% of the

total) occurs during the growing season, with until relatively recent periods of drought not being particularly common. Of course, there have been statewide droughts, such as the one in 1845, but more often the threat to Horry crops was flooding. Major floods have occurred in 1855, 1924, 1928, 1959, 1961, and 1973, with the September 1928 flood the largest known, reaching a stage of 12.75 feet above mean sea level (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1973:9).

The average growing season is about 234 days, although early freezes in the fall and late frosts in the spring can reduce this period by as much as 30 or more days (Dudley 1986:97). Consequently, most cotton planting, for example, did not take place until early May, avoiding the possibility that a late frost would damage the young seedlings.

## PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SYNOPSIS

### Previous Research

Horry has received rather spotty archaeological attention. Derting and his colleagues, for example, list only 67 reports associated with the county, with 41 of these (or 61%) representing highway or sewer surveys (Derting et al. 1991). Although dated, this indicates that the attention has been focused on relatively narrow, contained corridors, with only minor attention devoted to the area's rich prehistoric and protohistoric resources.

Considerable, primarily unpublished, research took place in the Myrtle Beach area during the 1960s at the Ellsworth Site by Erika Fogg-Amed, then a student of Reinhold Englemeyer at USC-Conway. Several test units were placed within the site which yielded Stallings, Thom's Creek, Hanover, and Cape Fear sherds, as well as a Morrow Mountain component (Fogg-Amed n.d. a). No site boundaries were established and, in fact, no site form has ever been filed.

Fogg-Amed also tested the "Coates Site," located about 10 miles north of Myrtle Beach on a high bluff overlooking a freshwater pond. Testing at this site yielded a dense shell midden that produced only lithic debitage (Fogg-Amed n.d. b). Again, no site form was filed.

Closer to the survey tract at least two project areas have been surveyed. These are compliance reports on developments/golf courses (Reid 2003 and Reid 2004). No significant sites were found on these parcels.

### Prehistoric Overview


The Paleoindian period, lasting from 12,000 to 8,000 B.C., is evidenced by basally

thinned, side-notched projectile points; fluted, lanceolate projectile points; side scrapers; end scrapers; and drills (Coe 1964; Michie 1977; Williams 1968). The Paleoindian occupation, while widespread, does not appear to have been intensive. Artifacts are most frequently found along major river drainages, which Michie interprets to support the concept of an economy "oriented towards the exploitation of now extinct mega-fauna" (Michie 1977:124).

Unfortunately, little is known about Paleoindian subsistence strategies, settlement systems, or social organization. Generally, archaeologists agree that the Paleoindian groups were at a band level of society (see Service 1966), were nomadic, and were both hunters and foragers. While population density, based on the isolated finds, is thought to have been low, Walthall suggests that toward the end of the period, "there was an increase in population density and in territoriality and that a number of new resource areas were beginning to be exploited" (Walthall 1980:30).

The Archaic period, which dates from 8000 to 2000 B.C., does not form a sharp break with the Paleoindian period, but is a slow transition characterized by a modern climate an increase in the diversity of material culture. Associated with this is a reliance on a broad spectrum of small mammals, although the white tailed deer was likely the most commonly exploited mammal. The chronology established by Coe (1964) for the North Carolina Piedmont may be applied with little modification to the South Carolina coastal plain and piedmont. Archaic period assemblages, characterized by corner-notched and broad stemmed projectile points, are fairly common, perhaps because the swamps and drainages offered especially attractive ecotones.





In the Coastal Plain of the South Carolina, there is an increase in the quantity of Early Archaic remains, probably associated with an increase in population and associated increase in the intensity of occupation. While Hardaway and Dalton points are typically found as isolated specimens along riverine environments, remains from the following Palmer phase are not only more common, but are also found in both riverine and interriverine settings. Kirks are likewise

common in the coastal plain (Goodyear et al. 1979).

The two primary Middle Archaic phases found in the coastal plain are the Morrow Mountain and Guilford (the Stanly and Halifax complexes identified by Coe are rarely encountered). Our best information on the Middle Woodland comes from sites investigated west of the Appalachian Mountains, such as the work in the Little Tennessee River Valley. The work at

Middle Archaic river valley sites, with their evidence of a diverse floral and faunal subsistence base, seems to stand in stark contrast to Caldwell's Middle Archaic "Old Quartz Industry" of Georgia and South Carolina, where axes, choppers, and ground and polished stone tools are very rare.

The Late Archaic is characterized by the appearance of large, square stemmed Savannah River projectile points (Coe 1964). These people continued the intensive exploitation of the uplands much like earlier Archaic groups. The bulk of our data for this period, however, comes from work in the Uwharrie region of North Carolina.

The Woodland period begins, by definition, with the introduction of fired clay pottery about 2000 B.C. along the South Carolina coast (the introduction of pottery, and hence the beginning of the Woodland period, occurs much later in the Piedmont of South Carolina). It should be noted that many researchers call the period from about 2500 to 1000 B.C. the Late Archaic because of a perceived continuation of the Archaic lifestyle in spite of the manufacture of pottery. Regardless of terminology, the period from 2500 to 1000 B.C. is well documented on the South Carolina coast and is characterized by Stallings (fiber-tempered) pottery. The subsistence economy during this early period was based primarily on deer hunting and fishing, with supplemental inclusions of small mammals, birds, reptiles, and shellfish.

Like the Stallings settlement pattern, Thom's Creek sites are found in a variety of environmental zones and take on several forms. Thom's Creek sites are found throughout the South Carolina Coastal Zone, Coastal Plain, and up to the Fall Line. The sites are found into the North Carolina Coastal Plain, but do not appear to extend southward into Georgia.

In the Coastal Plain drainage of the Savannah River there is a change of settlement, and probably subsistence, away from the riverine focus found in the Stallings Phase (Hanson

1982:13; Stoltman 1974:235-236). Thom's Creek sites are more commonly found in the upland areas and lack evidence of intensive shellfish collection. In the Coastal Zone large, irregular shell middens; small, sparse shell middens; and large "shell rings" are found in the Thom's Creek settlement system.

The Deptford phase, which dates from 1100 B.C. to A.D. 600, is best characterized by fine to coarse sandy paste pottery with a check stamped surface treatment. The Deptford settlement pattern involves both coastal and inland sites.

Inland sites such as 38AK228-W, 38LX5, 38RD60, and 38BM40 indicate the presence of an extensive Deptford occupation on the Fall Line and the Coastal Plain, although sandy, acidic soils preclude statements on the subsistence base (Anderson 1979; Ryan 1972; Trinkley 1980b). These interior or upland Deptford sites, however, are strongly associated with the swamp terrace edge, and this environment is productive not only in nut masts, but also in large mammals such as deer. Perhaps the best data concerning Deptford "base camps" comes from the Lewis-West site (38AK228-W), where evidence of abundant food remains, storage pit features, elaborate material culture, mortuary behavior, and craft specialization has been reported (Sassaman et al. 1990:96-98).

Throughout much of the Coastal Zone and Coastal Plain north of Charleston, a somewhat different cultural manifestation is observed, related to the "Northern Tradition" (e.g., Caldwell 1958). This recently identified assemblage has been termed Deep Creek and was first identified from northern North Carolina sites (Phelps 1983). The Deep Creek assemblage is characterized by pottery with medium to coarse sand inclusions and surface treatments of cord marking, fabric impressing, simple stamping, and net impressing. Much of this material has been previously designated as the Middle Woodland "Cape Fear" pottery originally typed by South (1976). The Deep Creek wares date from about 1000 B.C. to

A.D. 1 in North Carolina, but may date later in South Carolina. The Deep Creek settlement and subsistence systems are poorly known, but appear to be very similar to those identified with the Deptford phase.

The Deep Creek assemblage strongly resembles Deptford both typologically and temporally. It appears this northern tradition of cord and fabric impressions was introduced and gradually accepted by indigenous South Carolina populations. During this time, some groups continued making only the older carved paddle0stamped pottery, while others mixed the two styles, and still others (and later all) made exclusively cord and fabric stamped wares.

The Middle Woodland in South Carolina is characterized by a pattern of settlement mobility and short-term occupation. On the southern coast it is associated with the Wilmington phase, while on the northern coast it is recognized by the presence of Hanover, McClellanville or Santee, and Mount Pleasant assemblages. The best data concerning Middle Woodland Coastal Zone assemblages comes from Phelps' (1983:32-33) work in North Carolina. Associated items include a small variety of the Roanoke Large Triangular points (Coe 1964:110-111), sandstone abraders, shell pendants, polished stone gorgets, celts, and woven marsh mats. Significantly, both primary inhumation and cremations are found.

On the Coastal Plain of South Carolina, researchers are finding evidence of a Middle Woodland Yadkin assemblage, best known from Coe's work at the Doerschuk site in North Carolina (Coe 1964:25-26). Yadkin pottery is characterized by a crushed quartz temper and cord marked, fabric impressed, and linear check stamped surface treatments. The Yadkin ceramics are associated with medium-sized triangular points, although Oliver (1981) suggests that a continuation of the Piedmont Stemmed Tradition to at least A.D. 300 coexisted with this Triangular Tradition. The Yadkin series in South Carolina was first observed by Ward (1978, 1983) from the White's Creek drainage in Marlboro County,

South Carolina. Since then, a large Yadkin village has been identified by DePratter at the Dunlap site (38DA66) in Darlington County, South Carolina (Chester DePratter, personal communication 1985) and Blanton et al. (1986) and have excavated a small Yadkin site (389SU83) in Sumter County, South Carolina. Research at 38FL249 on the Roche Carolina tract in northern Florence County revealed an assemblage including Badin, Yadkin, and Wilmington wares (Trinkley et al. 1993:85-102). Anderson et al. (1982:299-302) offer additional typological assessments of the Yadkin wares in South Carolina.

Over the years, the suggestion that Cape Fear might be replaced by such types as Deep Creek and Mount Pleasant has raised considerable controversy. Taylor, for example, rejects the use of the North Carolina types in favor of those developed by Anderson et al. (1982) from their work at Mattassee Lake in Berkeley County (Taylor 1984:80). Cable (1991) is even less generous in his denouncement of ceramic constructs developed nearly a decade ago, also favoring adoption of the Mattassee Lake typology and chronology. This construct, recognizing five phases (Deptford I-III, McClellanville, and Santee I), uses a type variety system.

Regardless of terminology, these Middle Woodland Coastal Plain and Coastal Zone phases continue the Early Woodland Deptford pattern of mobility. While sites are found all along the coast and inland to the Fall Line, shell midden sites evidence sparse shell and artifacts. Gone are the abundant shell tools, worked bone items, and clay balls. Recent investigations at Coastal Zone sites such as 38BU747 and 38BU1214, however, have provided some evidence of worked bone and shell items at Deptford phase middens (see Trinkley 1990).

In many respects, the South Carolina Late Woodland may be characterized as a continuation of previous Middle Woodland cultural assemblages. While outside the Carolinas there were major cultural changes, such as the continued development and elaboration of

agriculture, the Carolina groups settled into a lifeway not appreciably different from that observed for the previous 500 to 700 years (cf. Sassaman et al. 1990:14-15). This situation would remain unchanged until the development of the South Appalachian Mississippian complex (see Ferguson 1971).

The South Appalachian Mississippian period, from about A.D. 1100 to A.D. 1640, is the most elaborate level of culture attained by the native inhabitants and is followed by cultural disintegration brought about largely by European disease. The period is characterized by complicated stamped pottery, complex social organization, agriculture, and the construction of temple mounds and ceremonial centers. The earliest phases include the Savannah and Pee Dee (A.D. 1200 to 1550).

### Historic Synopsis

The earliest activity in the Horry County area may have been the Spanish Ayllon movement from Rio Jordon (Cape Fear River) to San Miguel de Gualdape, 45 leagues distant. Some have argued that Fort San Miguel may have been at the mouth of Winyah Bay, although Paul Hoffman has recently suggested the fort was in Beaufort County, South Carolina or Chatham County, Georgia.

While the English settled Charleston in 1670, the northern frontier was ignored, except for the Indian trade, until 1731, when the first Royal Governor of Carolina, Robert Johnson, directed 11 townships to be laid out, including Kingston on the west bank of the Waccamaw. Kingston covered much of Georgetown and Horry counties and by 1734 the town of Kingston, later known as Conwayboro and eventually Conway, was founded. The township, however, was never erected into a parish, but remained part of the




Figure 6. Portion of Mills' Atlas showing the project vicinity.

Parish of Prince George, Winyah until 1785. In that year Prince George was divided into four districts and by 1801 Horry District was formally separated from Georgetown (Rogers 1972:9). The designation of "county" was not used until 1868. A variety of townships were established, including Simpson Creek and Little River on the south side of the Waccamaw River.

Prior to the Revolution there were few residents in Kingston and it was not until the late eighteenth century that English, French, Scotch, and Irish settlers began coming into the area. Many settlers in the early nineteenth century came from North Carolina and the northern seaboard states.

In spite of Horry's coastal plain situation, the area developed along vastly different lines than its southern neighbors Georgetown and Charleston. Horry District was always isolated from the remainder of South Carolina and had much stronger connections with North Carolina (Rogers 1972:3). The major traffic artery was the Waccamaw River and this reliance on river transport did not change until the highway development of the 1930s. Subsistence farming was the main occupation in the early 1800s and the farms were small, specializing in peas, wheat, rice, cotton, and corn, most for home consumption

(Rogers 1972:5). Mills notes that the population was,

mostly engaged in cultivating the soil. There are a few mechanics, such as blacksmiths, shoemakers, taylor[sic], halters, etc. (Mills 1972[1826]:583).

For Mills' *Atlas* of 1826, the Horry District was surveyed by Harlee in 1820. No settlements are shown in the project area (Figure 6). The absence of houses surrounding the project area may not so much indicate sparse settlement as it may reflect the subscription basis of Mills' *Atlas*. The subsistence farmers of Horry District may either have been unable to subscribe or may have had no need to let others know their location. The 1860 census for Horry District indicates that many of the farmers in Kingston, for example, could neither read nor write, further reducing the benefits of listing in an atlas.

The emphasis on subsistence farming appears to be the result of topography. Only 20% of the land is subject to the type of tidal overflow necessary for wet cultivation of rice. Mills (1972[1826]:581) notes that the river floodplain soil was productive where it could be reclaimed by drainage, while the upland soils were much less productive. This difference in quality is reflected in the prices for the land. Mills states that,

the low land swamps, when secured from the freshets, will sell for 40 or \$50 an acre. The uplands are valued at from \$4 down to 25 cents per acre (Mills 1972[1826]:581).

Interestingly, the price of "improved farms" ranged from \$20 to \$50 an acre as late as 1918 (Tillman et al. 1919:340). The few plantations found in Horry District were primarily located in All Saints Parish, east and south of the Waccamaw River. It was from this area that a small quantity of rice was exported throughout the nineteenth century (Rogers 1972:13).

Because the soils of Horry District were not able to support plantation agriculture a unique distribution of population and a very low percentage of slaves were found in the region. Horry County also continued to play a minor role in state politics. The area, prior to the Civil War, was oriented to smaller farmers and never developed an aristocratic plantation society with political and economic powers. Most of the farms, including the larger ones, were situated in Kingston Township. The 1860 census indicates that of the 782 farms, 560 were in Kingston (Rogers 1972:12). In 1860, the population was 2,606 and there were only 708 slaves. This ratio of 70% white and 30% blacks has not only remained stable into the twentieth century, but also stands in contrast to Georgetown District where about 12% of the population was white and 88% was black until the 1880 census, when the white population increased to about 20% (Rogers 1972).

Horry District never sided with the radical secessionists, possibly because of the influence of northern immigrants or because of the resentment of the political and economic power of slave owners. In any event, Horry County responded "enthusiastically" to the call for volunteers at the outbreak of the Civil War (Rogers 1972:35).

By the 1830s, a new industry was competing with farming in the Horry area. Northern immigrants from Maine, coupled with "pine woods speculators" from North Carolina began to exploit the forest products of both the uplands and swamp areas (Tillman et al. 1919:330; Berry 1970; Rogers 1972:14). The Horry District was the leading turpentine producer in South Carolina by 1860, producing products valued at \$392,643. The lumber and turpentine industry continued to grow rapidly after the Civil War. Tobacco was introduced about 1850, but was not an important crop until after the Civil War, lead by the Green Sea Township.

Horry District saw little involvement in the Civil War, although 925 of the 1,000 men in the voting population volunteered for duty and




Figure 7. Portion of the 1918 Horry County Soil Survey showing the project area.

served (Rogers 1972:35). Fort Randell was established at Clardy's Point on the Little River and saw skirmishes in 1863 and 1865. The salt works of Peter Vaught, Sr. at Singleton Swash were raided in April 1864, and in 1865 a Union expedition was led up the Waccamaw to destroy ferries at Bull Creek and Yahannah (Rogers 1972:35-38).

After the Civil War, Horry was part of the Military District of Eastern South Carolina, but the Federal stay was short and by 1866 military troops had left Horry County. This absence of Federal troops continued throughout Reconstruction and the Democrats maintained political control throughout the period. Further, there was no land distribution in Horry County, possibly because there was really no land work distributing (Rogers 1972:47). Following the Civil War a number of changes began to affect the Horry area. Tobacco began to be a more important crop, the first county bank was organized in 1880, the railroad and telegraph arrived in 1887, and in 1869 a regular weekly county newspaper appeared (the *Horry Weekly News*, which published until 1877). Conwayboro was changed to Conway in 1883 and the only other "major" town continued to be Little River.

The turpentine business boomed in the 1870s and by 1880 there were 21 operators in the county, producing \$181,400 annually (Rogers 1972:50). Farming, however, continued to be important. In 1870 there were 1,300 farms averaging 50 acres in size. The major crops were still subsistence items such as corn, sweet potatoes, and rice. Few wage employees were found in Horry (Rogers 1972:58). The Socastee and Little River townships had the richest farms and the five largest farms also produced turpentine in 1870 (Rogers 1972:60). The Grange movement arrived in Horry County relatively late, never organized in many areas, and failed

by the late 1870s.

By 1910, the County population had increased to almost 27,000 but there was no town, including Conway, with a population of at least 2,500. Conway continued, however, to have strong lumbering and mercantile interests. With the gradual decline of lumbering and the turpentine industry, farming was once again the dominant activity in the county. The period from 1880 to 1910 saw corn acreage increase 140%, cotton acreage increase 90%, and tobacco acreage increase from 19 to 5,347 acres. During the same time rice production fell from 747,689 to 1,210 pounds (Tillman et al. 1919:333). By 1919 the chief money crops were corn, cotton, and tobacco, although corn was largely used to supply the home and fatten stock. After 1895, tobacco began to replace cotton as a prime money crop and by 1910 was "grown more or less generally over a county by small farmers who live on their farms and superintend the work" (Tillman et al. 1919:335).

The 1918 soil survey map shows two structures in the survey area (Figure 7). No artifacts were found, however, that appear to predate 1950. This is likely the result of the






Figure 8. Portion of the 1939 *General Highway and Transportation Map of Horry County* showing the project area.

massive amounts of modern materials that were present on the tract, the construction of a pond, and the years of cultivation that would have erased much of the archaeological footprint. Any older materials would have been overshadowed or destroyed, resulting in poor integrity.

In the early twentieth century, hogs were the principle source of livestock income. These animals were usually slaughtered in the fall for home use or sale on the local market. Cattle were mostly scrub stock and dairying was neglected. Farm equipment was largely inadequate in the early 1900s and most of the plowing was done with one ox or mule. On many small farms the adequacy of farm equipment did not appreciably improve into the 1940s, when the probate inventory for one small Horry farmer listed only one mule, a one-horse wagon, one disc, four plows, one lot hoes, one guano distributor, a tobacco sprayer, and a corn planter (Trinkley and Caballero 1983:8). Tillman et al. (1919:338) indicate that in the early 1900s plowing was seldom more than 2 to 3 inches deep because of the poor machinery. It is suggested that this lack of equipment was not entirely related to a lack of prosperity, but rather was largely the result of cheap labor. Tillman et al. report that, "negro men

receive 75 cents to \$1.25 a day . . . while negro women are paid 50 to 65 cents a day" (Tillman et al. 1919:340).

Horry County, in 1910, had a relatively low rate of farm tenancy. The 1939 *General Highway and Transportation Map of Horry County* (Figure 8) shows two possible structures on the property. These structures appear to be the same structures as shown on the 1918 map. As previously mentioned, so much modern trash, such as various broken down cars and piles of debris, was found and no artifacts were recovered that could be definitively dated to before 1950. Even if remains were found, the integrity would have been destroyed by the enormous amounts of modern

trash and cultivation.

Tillman et al. (1919:340) indicate that 72.9% of the farms were operated by owners and 27% by tenants. The average size of such farms (each tenancy is classified as a farm) was 117.8 acres. This is contrasted with piedmont Spartanburg, where in 1920 32.1% of the farms were operated by their owners and 67.7% were operated by tenants. In Spartanburg, where cotton was still king, the average farm size was 49.4 acres (Latimer et al. 1924:419). This dichotomy documents the differences between tenancy in the Atlantic Coastal Plain, where there was a low "devotion" to cotton, and in the Black Belt and Upper Piedmont, where cotton was more important, tenancy rates higher, and farm size smaller (see Woofter et al. 1936).

## RESEARCH METHODS AND FINDINGS

### Archaeological Field Methods and Findings

The initially proposed field techniques involved the placement of shovel tests at 100 foot intervals along transects placed at 100 foot intervals.

All soil would be screened through ¼ - inch mesh, with each test numbered sequentially by transect. Each test would measure about 1 foot square and would normally be taken to a depth of at least 1 foot or until sterile subsoil was encountered. All cultural remains would be collected, except for mortar and brick, which would be quantitatively noted in the field and discarded. Notes would be maintained for profiles at any sites encountered. A total number of 561 shovel tests were excavated along 64 transects.

Should sites (defined by the presence of two or more artifacts from either surface survey or shovel tests within a 50 feet area) be identified, further tests would be used to obtain data on site boundaries, artifact quantity and diversity, site integrity, and temporal affiliation. These tests would be placed at 25 to 50 feet intervals in a simple cruciform pattern until two consecutive negative shovel tests were encountered. The information required for completion of South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology site forms would be collected and photographs would be taken, if warranted in the opinion of the field investigators.

These proposed techniques were implemented with no significant modifications. A series of 64 transects were established running primarily west to east through the center of the project area. Wetlands and poorly drained soils were not shovel tested. Individual shovel tests were numbered to the north or south along these

transects. The survey area was mostly wooded in a dense mixed pine and hardwood forest. A dense understory was also present.

Sites would be evaluated for further work based on the eligibility criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. Chicora Foundation only provides an opinion of National Register eligibility and the final determination is made by the lead agency in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

Analysis of collections would follow professionally accepted standards with a level of intensity suitable to the quantity and quality of the remains. However, the archaeological survey of the project area failed to identify any remains. This is most likely because of the lack of a distinct ridge top and distance from a permanent water source. The modern topographic map, which was created in 1990, shows four structures on the property. All of these structures were located and the remains appear to be post-1950 in date (Figure 10). No artifacts were found that appear to be distinct enough to be potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

The structures shown on the 1918 (Figure 7) and 1939 (Figure 8) maps do not appear to be the same structures as shown on the 1990 map. A close examination of the maps reveals a slightly different location. For example, the more western settlement, when measured on the map and compared to the modern topographic map, shows that the structure may have been located in the area where a pond is currently located. The more eastern structure may have once existed next to an existing wetland. This was an area that was intensively cultivated until as recently as 1990. Between the structure being intentionally removed from the landscape and subsequent cultivation for






Figure 9. Survey area (red) with transects in the area surveyed (black) and wetland/poorly drained soils (outlined in yellow).

at least 50 years, no archaeological footprint was found.

As was previously mentioned, an enormous amount of modern debris, such as broken down cars and trash piles, was found and no artifacts could be definitively dated to before 1950. Even if these sites were pre-1950 in date, the integrity has been severely damaged by modern activities and so they would not be eligible for the National Register.

### **Architectural Survey**

As previously discussed, we elected to use a 0.5 mile area of potential effect (APE). The architectural survey would record buildings, sites, structures, and objects that appeared to have been

constructed before 1950 and which retained their integrity. Those which have undergone such extensive modifications to preclude their eligibility were not recorded.

For each identified resource, an architectural survey form would be completed and at least two representative photographs would be taken. Permanent control numbers would be assigned by the S.C. Department of Archives and History at the conclusion of the study. The site forms for the resources identified during this study would then be submitted to the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office.

### **Site Evaluation and Findings**

Archaeological sites would be evaluated



Figure 10. View of a brick pillar from a razed structure on the property.

for further work based on the eligibility criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. Chicora Foundation only provides an opinion of National Register eligibility and the final determination is made by the lead federal agency, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

The criteria for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places is described by 36CFR60.4, which states:

the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design,

setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and

a. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

b. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our

past; or

c. that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent



Figure 11. View of graves from Mt. Calvery Cemetery.





Figure 12. View of cemetery across dirt road from the project area.

a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

d. that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

*National Register Bulletin 36* (Townsend et al. 1993) provides an evaluative process that contains five steps for forming a clearly defined explicit rationale for either the site's eligibility or lack of eligibility. Briefly, these steps are:

- identification of the site's data sets or categories of archaeological information such as ceramics, lithics,

subsistence remains, architectural remains, or subsurface features;

- identification of the historic context applicable to the site, providing a framework for the evaluative process;

- identification of the important research questions the site might be able to address, given the data sets

and the context;

- evaluation of the site's archaeological integrity to ensure that the data sets were sufficiently well preserved to address the research questions; and

- identification of important



Figure 13. View of project area (woods) from the middle of the cemetery. Note that marked graves stop about 75 feet from the dirt road.

research questions among all of those which might be asked and answered at the site.

This approach, of course, has been developed for use documenting eligibility of sites being actually nominated to the National Register of Historic Places where the evaluative process must stand alone, with relatively little reference to other documentation and where typically only one site is being considered. As a result, some aspects of the evaluative process have been summarized, but we have tried to focus on each archaeological site's ability to address significant research topics within the context of its available data sets.

The roads within 0.5 mile around the survey area were driven in order to locate any structure, object, or site that might be potentially eligible for the National Register. No such structures were found, however one cemetery, the Mt. Calvary Cemetery, was found adjacent to the current survey area (Figure 11).

The cemetery, which has approximately 50 marked graves, dates from about 1908 to 2004. However, only one headstone dates to 1908, then the next earliest date is 1932, then 1942. The majority of graves post date 1950. While some marble headstones were present, the majority of graves were marked by visible vault tops, which were painted white, an African-American custom, or simply marked by a funeral home plaque.

Modern maps show the cemetery as possibly intruding on the current survey area, but it was observed in the field that a dirt road separates the two properties (Figures 12 and 13). Historically, African-American

cemeteries have been known to have a significant number of unmarked graves that also may extend beyond recognized boundaries. While this may be the case with Mt. Calvary Cemetery, it does not seem likely that the cemetery would extend to the south past the road, which appears to be original. Instead, extension of the cemetery would seem more likely to occur to the north and east into the existing forest; however, no depressions were observed off the surveyed portion of the cemetery.

This cemetery does not appear to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The cemetery appears to be isolated from the current undertaking, and will avoid any negative impact. However, care should be taken by construction crews to avoid the property that belongs to the cemetery.

As previously mentioned, no additional structures were found that appear to contain the integrity needed for inclusion on the National Register. This area is being quickly developed, with a large neighborhood being built just south



Figure 14. View of construction south from the project area.

across S-111 from the current project area (Figure 14).



## CONCLUSIONS

This study involved the examination of a 202 acre tract (142 acres of upland) east Horry County, South Carolina. The tract is proposed for residential development. This report, conducted for Mr. Joe Floyd of the Brigman Company, Inc., provides the results of that investigation and is intended to assist the company comply with their historic preservation responsibilities.

The survey area consists of areas of dense mixed pines and hardwoods and wetlands. The archaeological survey, which included close interval shovel testing of the upland areas conducted at 100-foot intervals, failed to uncover any archaeological sites. This is likely the result of the lack of a distinct ridge top and distance from a permanent water source.

Two maps, from 1918 and 1939 (Figures 7 and 8) reveal that portions of the property have historically been farmed, and included tenants. When the 1918 and 1939 maps are compared it seems likely that the locations of the two settlements remained consistent, suggesting occupation for at least 20 years. Nevertheless, neither settlement could be identified during this survey.

The more western settlement was likely in the vicinity of Transects 35 through 38, with the owner's house close to the road. The eastern settlement would have been in the vicinity of Transects 48-49, again close to the main road. The absence of a clear archaeological footprint may be the result of intensive post-occupation cultivation with the tenant sites intentionally removed from the landscape, coupled with the subsequent silviculture. In addition, a lake/pond has been created adjacent to the highway at Transect 35 and this may have impacted the owner's site.

It is certainly possible that more intensive

archaeological study with the use of close interval testing might reveal some evidence of these sites. These integrity of these areas have been severely affected by modern activities such as the pond construction and large trash piles. Such work, however, seems unreasonable since no evidence was identified using what constitutes good practice for site discovery. Consequently, we recommend no further investigation in these areas. However, the developer should be made aware of the need to report any late discoveries. In this case such unexpected finds might include large number of bottles, perhaps found associated with a privy or well, or large trash deposits, perhaps associated with household disposal areas. The requirements of such late discovery provisions will be discussed below.

The surrounding area is being quickly developed with a neighborhood being constructed directly across from the current project area. Nevertheless, an APE 0.5 mile around the project area was examined.

No structures were identified, however, the Mt. Calvary Cemetery is located adjacent to the current undertaking. The cemetery does not appear to be eligible for the National Register, but care needs to be taken that construction activities avoid the property.

It is possible that archaeological remains may be encountered in the area during construction (as discussed above). As always, contractors should be advised to report any discoveries of concentrations of artifacts (such as bottles, ceramics, or projectile points) or brick rubble to the project engineer, who should in turn report the material to the State Historic Preservation Office, or Chicora Foundation (the process of dealing with late discoveries is discussed in 36CFR800.13(b)(3)). No further land

altering activities should take place in the vicinity of these discoveries until they have been examined by an archaeologist and, if necessary, have been processed according to 36CFR800.13(b)(3).

## SOURCES CITED

- Anderson, David G.  
1979 *Excavations at Four Fall Line Sites: The Southeastern Beltway Project.* Commonwealth Associates, Inc., Jacksonville, Michigan. Submitted to the South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation, Columbia.
- Anderson, David G., Charles E. Cantley, and A. Lee Novick  
1982 *The Mattassee Lake Sites: Archaeological Investigations Along the Lower Santee River in the Coastal Plain of South Carolina.* Commonwealth Associates, Jackson, Michigan.
- Berry, C.B.  
1970 *The Colonial Period. Independent Republic Quarterly* 9(1):13-15.
- Blanton, Dennis B., Christopher T. Espenshade, and Paul E. Brockington, Jr.  
1986 *An Archaeological Study of 38SU83: A Yadkin Phase Site in the Upper Coastal Plain of South Carolina.* Garrow and Associates, Inc., Atlanta.
- Brown, Paul J.  
1975 *Coastal Morphology of South Carolina.* Unpublished M.S. Thesis, Department of Geology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Cable, John  
1991 *Archaeological Test Excavations on the Northeastern Perimeter of the Buck Hall Site (38CH644), Francis Marion National Forest, South Carolina.* New South Associates, Irmo, South Carolina.
- Caldwell, Joseph R.  
1958 *Trend and Tradition in the Prehistory of the Eastern United States.* Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association 88.
- Coe, Joffre L.  
1964 *The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 54(5).
- Cooke, C. Wythe  
1936 *Geology of the Coastal Plain of South Carolina.* Bulletin 867. U.S. Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.
- Derting, Keith M., Sharon L. Pekarul, and Charles J. Rinehart  
1991 *A Comprehensive Bibliography of South Carolina Archaeology.* Research Manuscript 211. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Dudley, Travis A.  
1986 *Soil Survey of Horry County, South Carolina.* U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Washington, D.C.
- Ellerbe, Clarence M.  
1974 *South Carolina Soils and Their Interpretations for Selected Uses.* S.C. Land Resources Commission, Columbia.



- Ferguson, Leland G.  
 1971 *South Appalachian Mississippian*.  
 Ph.D. dissertation, University of  
 North Carolina, Chapel Hill.  
 University Microfilms, Ann  
 Arbor, Michigan.
- Fogg-Amed, Erika  
 n.d. a Sites dug Summer of 1964 (and  
 Fall, 1963), Summer of 1965. Field  
 notes on file, S.C. Institute of  
 Archaeology and Anthropology,  
 University of South Carolina,  
 Columbia.
- n.d. b Notes on Archaeological Work  
 Done on the Northeast Coast of  
 South Carolina, 1963-1965. Field  
 notes on file, S.C. Institute of  
 Archaeology and Anthropology,  
 University of South Carolina,  
 Columbia.
- Goodyear, Albert C., John H. House, and Neal W.  
 Ackerly  
 1979 *Laurens-Anderson: An  
 Archaeological Study of the Inter-  
 Riverine Piedmont*.  
 Anthropological Studies 4,  
 Occasional Papers of the Institute  
 of Archaeology and  
 Anthropology, University of  
 South Carolina, Columbia.
- Hanson, Glen T., Jr.  
 1982 The Analysis of Late Archaic-  
 Early Woodland Adaptive  
 Change Along the Middle  
 Savannah River: A Proposed  
 Study. *South Carolina Institute of  
 Archaeology and Anthropology  
 Notebook* 14:1-38.
- Küchler, A.W.  
 1964 *Potential Natural Vegetation of the  
 Conterminous United States*.  
 Special Publication No. 36.  
 American Geographical Society,  
 New York.
- Mathew, William M., editor  
 1992 *Agriculture, Geology, and Society in  
 Antebellum South Carolina: The  
 Private Diary of Edmund Ruffin,  
 1843*. University of Georgia Press,  
 Athens.
- Michie, James L.  
 1977 *The Late Pleistocene Human  
 Occupation of South Carolina*.  
 Unpublished Honor's Thesis,  
 Department of Anthropology,  
 University of South Carolina,  
 Columbia.
- Mills, Robert  
 1972 [1826] *Statistics of South Carolina*.  
 Hurlbut and Lloyd, Charleston,  
 South Carolina. 1972 facsimile ed.  
 The Reprint Company,  
 Spartanburg, South Carolina.
- Oliver, Billy L.  
 1981 *The Piedmont Tradition: Refinement  
 of the Savannah River Stemmed  
 Point Type*. Unpublished Master's  
 thesis, Department of  
 Anthropology, University of  
 North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Phelps, David A.  
 1983 Archaeology of the North  
 Carolina Coast and Coastal Plain:  
 Problems and Hypotheses. In *The  
 Prehistory of North Carolina: An  
 Archaeological Symposium*, edited  
 by Mark A. Mathis and Jeffrey J.  
 Crow, pp. 1-52. North Carolina  
 Division of Archives and History,  
 Department of Cultural  
 Resources, Raleigh.
- Reid, Dawn  
 2003 *Archaeological Survey and Testing  
 at the Glen Dornoch Golf Course*.

## SOURCES CITED

- Archaeological Consultants of the Carolinas, Inc.
- 2004 *Archaeological Survey of Bay Tree Golf Plantation Development Tracts*. Archaeological Consultants of the Carolinas, Inc.
- Rogers, James S., III  
1972 *The History of Horry County, South Carolina, 1850-1876*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Department of History, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Ryan, Thomas M.  
1972 *Archaeological Survey of the Columbia Zoological Park, Richland and Lexington Counties, South Carolina*. Research Manuscript Series 37. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Sassaman, Kenneth E., Mark J. Brooks, Glen T. Hanson, and David G. Anderson  
1990 *Native American Prehistory of the Middle Savannah River Valley*. Savannah River Archaeological Research Papers 1. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Service, E.M.  
1966 *The Hunters*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Smith, Lynwood  
1933 *Physiography of South Carolina*. Unpublished M.S. Thesis, Department of Geology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- South, Stanley A.  
1976 *An Archaeological Survey of Southeastern North Carolina*. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology Notebook 93.
- Stoltman, James B.  
1974 *Groton Plantation: An Archaeological Study of a South Carolina Locality*. Monographs of the Peabody Museum 1, Harvard University, Cambridge.
- Taylor, Richard L., editor  
1984 *Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Pee Dee Electric Generating Facility in Florence County, South Carolina*. Commonwealth Associates, Jackson, Michigan.
- Tillman, B.W., W.E. McLendon, H.H. Krusehopf, A.C. Anderson, Cornelius Van Duyne, and W.J. Latimer  
1919 *Soil Survey of Horry County, South Carolina. Field Operations of the Bureau of Soils* 1918:329-376.
- Townsend, Jan, John H. Sprinkle, Jr., and John Knoerl  
1993 *Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Historical Archaeological Sites and Districts*. Bulletin 36. National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places, Washington, D.C.
- Trinkley, Michael  
1980a *Additional Investigations at 38LX5*. South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation, Columbia.  
1980b *Investigation of the Woodland Period Along the South Carolina Coast*. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.  
1990 *An Archaeological Context for the*

- South Carolina Woodland Period.*  
Chicora Foundation Research  
Series 22. Chicora Foundation,  
Inc., Columbia, S.C.
- Trinkley, Michael and Olga M. Caballero  
1983 *Additional Archaeological,  
Historical, and Architectural  
Evaluation of 38HR127 and  
38HR131, Horry County, South  
Carolina.* S.C. Department of  
Highways and Public  
Transportation, Columbia.
- Trinkley, Michael, Debi Hacker, and Natalie  
Adams  
1993 *Life in the Pee Dee: Prehistoric and  
Historic Research on the Roche  
Carolina Tract, Florence County,  
South Carolina.* Research Series 39.  
Chicora Foundation Inc.,  
Columbia.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
1973 *Flood Plain Information B  
Waccamaw River, Kingston Lake  
Swamp, Crab Tree Swamp, City of  
Conway, South Carolina.*  
Charleston District, Corps of  
Engineers, Charleston, South  
Carolina.
- Utterback, J. David  
1988 *Architectural and Historic Survey of  
Horry County, South Carolina.* J.  
David Utterback, Inc., Socastee,  
South Carolina.
- Vivian, Daniel J.  
n.d. *South Carolina Statewide Survey of  
Historic Properties.* S.C.  
Department of Archives and  
History, Columbia.
- Waccamaw Regional Planning and Development  
Council  
1973 *Horry County Survey of Historic  
Places.* Waccamaw Regional  
Planning and Development  
Council, Georgetown.
- Walthall, John A.  
1980 *Prehistoric Indians of the Southeast:  
Archaeology of Alabama.*  
University of Alabama Press,  
University.
- Ward, Trawick  
1978 *The Archaeology of Whites Creek,  
Marlboro County, South Carolina.*  
Research Laboratories of  
Anthropology, University of  
North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- 1983 *Whites Creek: The Second Time  
Around.* *South Carolina Antiquities*  
15:63-65.
- Williams, Stephen B., editor  
1968 *The Waring Papers: The Collected  
Works of Antonio J. Waring, Jr.*  
Papers of the Peabody Museum  
of Archaeology and Ethnology  
58.
- Woofter, T.J., Jr.  
1936 *Landlord and Tenant of the Cotton  
Plantation.* Research Monograph  
5. Division of Social Research,  
Works Progress Administration,  
Washington, D.C.

**Archaeological  
Investigations**

**Historical Research**

**Preservation**

**Education**

**Interpretation**

**Heritage Marketing**

**Museum Support  
Programs**



**Chicora Foundation, Inc.**  
PO Box 8664 • 861 Arbutus Drive  
Columbia, SC 29202-8664  
Tel: 803-787-6910  
Fax: 803-787-6910  
Email: [Chicora@bellsouth.net](mailto:Chicora@bellsouth.net)  
[www.chicora.org](http://www.chicora.org)